



TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP  
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER  
EIGHTH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-3834

**COPY MAILED**

MAY 10 2005

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Application of  
Motasim Sirhan et al.  
Application No. 10/017,500  
Filed: December 14, 2001  
Attorney Docket No. 020460-001000US

:  
: DECISION ON PETITIONS  
: UNDER 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) AND  
: UNDER 37 CFR 1.78(a)(6)  
:

This is a decision on the renewed petition under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6), filed September 20, 2004, to accept an unintentionally delayed claim under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and 119(e) for the benefit of the prior-filed nonprovisional and provisional applications set forth in the concurrently filed amendment.

The renewed petition is **DISMISSED**.

A petition filed July 19, 2004 was dismissed August 30, 2004 because the amendment filed with the petition improperly incorporated by reference the prior filed application. Comes now petitioner with the instant renewed petition which still has not deleted the improper incorporation by reference statement from the amendment filed.

A petition for acceptance of a claim for late priority under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6) is only applicable to those applications filed on or after November 29, 2000. Further, the petition is appropriate only after the expiration of the period specified in 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and 1.78(a)(5)(ii). In addition, the petition under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6) must be accompanied by:

- (1) the reference required by 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and 119(e) and 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(2)(i) and 1.78(a)(5)(i) of the prior-filed application, unless previously submitted;
- (2) the surcharge set forth in § 1.17(t); and
- (3) a statement that the entire delay between the date the claim was due under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and 1.78(a)(5)(ii) and the date the claim was filed was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional.

The petition still fails to comply with item (1) above.

A reference to add the prior-filed applications on page one following the first sentence of the specification has been included in an amendment filed on July 19, 2004 and again with the instant petition filed September 20, 2004. However, the amendment is not acceptable as drafted since it improperly incorporates by reference the prior-filed applications. Petitioner's attention is again directed to Dart Industries v. Banner, 636 F.2d 684, 207 USPQ 273 (C.A.D.C. 1980), where the court drew a distinction between a permissible 35 U.S.C. § 120 statement and the impermissible introduction of new matter by way of incorporation by reference in a 35 U.S.C. § 120 statement. The court specifically stated:

Section 120 merely provides a mechanism whereby an application becomes entitled to benefit of the filing date of an earlier application disclosing the same subject matter. Common subject matter must be disclosed, in both applications, either specifically or by an express incorporation-by-reference of prior disclosed subject matter. Nothing in section 120 itself operates to carry forward any disclosure from an earlier application. In re deSeversky, *supra* at 674, 177 USPQ at 146-147. Section 120 contains no magical disclosure-augmenting powers able to pierce new matter barriers. It cannot, therefore, "limit" the absolute and express prohibition against new matter contained in section 251.

In order for the incorporation by reference statement to be effective as a proper safeguard against the omission of a portion of a prior application, the incorporation by reference statement must be included in the specification-as-filed, or in an amendment specifically referred to in an oath or declaration executing the application. See In re deSeversky, *supra*. Note also MPEP 201.06(c).

Accordingly, before the petition under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6) can be granted, a renewed petition under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6) and a substitute amendment<sup>1</sup> deleting the improper incorporation by reference statement is required.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail:                      Mail Stop PETITIONS  
                                    Commissioner for Patents  
                                    Post Office Box 1450  
                                    Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

---

<sup>1</sup> Note 37 CFR 1.121

By hand: Customer Window located at:

2011 South Clark Place  
Crystal Plaza Two Lobby  
Room 1B03  
Arlington, VA 22202

By fax: (703) 872-9306  
ATTN: Office of Petitions

Any inquiries concerning this decision may be directed to Senior Petitions Attorney Patricia Faison-Ball at (571) 272-3212.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Frances Hicks".

Frances Hicks  
Lead Petitions Examiner  
Office of Petitions  
Office of the Deputy Commissioner  
for Patent Examination Policy